



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,145	08/25/2003	Richard Harvey	063170.6608	3233
5073	7590	09/08/2009		
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			EXAMINER LEWIS, ALICIA M	
			ART UNIT 2164	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/08/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/648,145	Applicant(s) HARVEY ET AL.	
	Examiner Alicia M. Lewis	Art Unit 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/19/09, 8/17/09 and 8/17/09</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to communication filed May 19, 2009. Claims 1-8 are currently amended, and claims 9-20 have been added. Thus, claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on May 19, 2009 and August 17, 2009 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1 and 4 are objected to because of the following informalities: The preamble of claims 1 and 4 should be amended to recite a “computer-implemented” method to show that the method is performed by a computer. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 4 and 8 recite, in part, “removing the portion of the hierarchical structure or relationship determined to have the one-to-one relationship by moving a content of the second object into a third object, each of the second and third objects comprising a

Art Unit: 2164

child object of the first object.” This limitation is ambiguous and unclear. For example, it is unclear as to how the second object comprises a child object of the first object, since the second object is a child object of the first object. Furthermore, it is unclear as to how the third object relates to the first object. Claims 4 and 8 also recite flattening by moving contents into at least one third object. However, the specification teaches flattening by moving contents into a parent portion and not a child portion (paragraph 134 of the PG-Pub). Further, there is no clear description of the above limitation in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cutlip (US 2004/0039738 A1).

With respect to claims 1 and 5, Cutlip teaches a method for use in a web services system having complex UDDI object(s) (paragraphs 4 and 24), the method comprising:

providing a database for storing at least one directory parent object within a first object class, the at least one directory parent object including a plurality of attributes, the at least one direct parent object comprising a repeating attribute that occurs more than once in the at least one directory parent object (Figs. 3, 15A and 15B, paragraphs 40, 43, 45 and 70);

using a processor in communication with the database to create a first directory child object for storing a first value associated with the repeating attributes, the first directory child object also within the first object class (Figs. 3, 15A and 15B, paragraphs 40, 43 and 70); and

storing, in the database, the value associated with the repeating attribute in the first directory child object (Figs. 3, 15A and 15B, paragraphs 40, 43 and 70).

With respect to claims 2 and 6, Cutlip teaches using the processor to create a second directory child object (*i.e. Acme Service Number 2*) for storing a second value associated with the repeating attribute, the second child object also within the first object class (Figs. 3, 15A and 15B, paragraphs 40, 43 and 70).

With respect to claims 3 and 7, Cutlip teaches wherein the parent object is at least one of a business entity, business service, binding template and tmodel (Fig. 3, paragraph 43).

Art Unit: 2164

With respect to claims 13 and 17, Cutlip teaches further comprising creating a searchable index of the first value associated with the repeating attribute (paragraphs 22 and 76, claim 3).

With respect to claims 14 and 18, Cutlip teaches storing at least one unique attribute in the directory parent object (paragraph 43).

With respect to claims 15 and 19, Cutlip teaches wherein the directory parent object comprises a business entity and the at least one unique attribute comprises a business key (Figs. 3 and 10, paragraphs 43 and 45).

With respect to claims 16 and 20, Cutlip teaches wherein the first directory child object is selected from the group consisting of name, description, contact, discovery URL, keyed references and business services (Fig.3, paragraphs 42-43).

7. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gadbois et al. (US 2004/0002955 A1) ('Gadbois').

With respect to claims 1 and 5, Gadbois teaches a method for use in a web services system having complex UDDI object(s) (paragraphs 21 and 24), the method comprising:

providing a database for storing at least one directory parent object within a first object class, the at least one directory parent object including a plurality of attributes, the at least one direct parent object comprising a repeating attribute that occurs more than once in the at least one directory parent object (Fig. 2, paragraphs 27-28);

using a processor in communication with the database to create a first directory child object for storing a first value associated with the repeating attributes, the first directory child object also within the first object class (Fig. 2, paragraph 28); and

storing, in the database, the value associated with the repeating attribute in the first directory child object (Fig. 2, paragraphs 28).

With respect to claims 2 and 6, Gadbois teaches using the processor to create a second directory child object (*i.e. Business Service 2*) for storing a second value associated with the repeating attribute, the second child object also within the first object class (Fig. 2, paragraph 28).

With respect to claims 3 and 7, Gadbois teaches wherein the parent object is at least one of a business entity, business service, binding template and tmodel (Fig. 2, paragraph 27).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2164

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gadbois et al. (US 2004/0002955 A1) ('Gadbois') in view of Gill (US 6,947,951 B1).

With respect to claims 4 and 8, Gadbois teaches a method of flattening a hierarchy in a web services arrangement, the method comprising:

providing a database for storing a plurality of UDDI objects (paragraphs 21-23);
using a processor in communication with the database to determine that a portion of a hierarchical structure or relationship in the web services arrangement has a one-to-one relationship between first and second objects (elements 224 and 272 in Figure 2); and

moving a content of the second object into a third object, each of the second and third objects comprising a child object of the first object (Figure 2, paragraph 28) (*information about business services, i.e. information from Business Service node 272, is contained/moved into sub node business service 274*), each of the second and third objects comprising a child object of the first object (elements 224, 272 and 274 in Figure 2).

Although Gadbois teaches moving content into a third object based on the one-to-one relationship, he does not explicitly teach using the processor to remove the portion of the hierarchical structure or relationship determined to have the one-to-one relationship by moving a content of the second object into a third object.

Gill teaches a system for modeling a business (see abstract), in which he teaches using the processor to remove the portion of the hierarchical structure or relationship determined to have the one-to-one relationship by moving a content of the second object into a third object (column 5 lines 49-51) (*Gill teaches that when a level is removed (second objects), child members (third objects) are reassigned to the original grandparent member (first object); thus content of the second objects is moved into third objects, and the third object becomes a child of the first object*).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Gadbois by the teaching of Gill because using the processor to remove the portion of the hierarchical structure or relationship determined to have the one-to-one relationship by moving a content of the second object into a third object would enable an improved data structure and data handling systems for supporting business operations (Gill, column 2 lines 31-33).

With respect to claims 9 and 11, Gadbois in view of Gill teaches wherein the first object is at least one of a business entity, business service, binding template and tmodel (Gadbois, Figure 2, paragraphs 27-28).

With respect to claims 10 and 12, Gadbois in view of Gill teaches wherein the second object is a relationship object (Gadbois, Figure 2; Gill, column 7 lines 48-60).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4 and 8-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

11. Applicant's arguments filed May 19, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Cutlip and Gadbois each fail to teach the claimed elements of claims 1 and 5. Examiner disagrees. Both Cutlip and Gadbois teach directory parent objects having repeating attributes and creating a directory child object associated with the repeating attributes. For example, Cutlip teaches a directory parent object business entity 320, which has 1 to many discovery URLS, one to many contacts and zero to many business services (Figure 3). Furthermore, Figures 15A and 15B represent a business entity having two different business services. Thus it is clear that the parent object has repeating attributes (evidenced by the one to many relationships), and a value associated with the repeating attributes are stored as directory child objects.

12. Likewise Gadbois teaches directory parent objects (i.e. business services node 242) having repeating attributes (i.e. business service1 and business service 2) and creating a directory child object associated with the repeating attributes (i.e. child nodes 243 and 244). Thus it is clear that the parent object of Gadbois also has repeating attributes (evidenced by the one to many relationships), and a value associated with the repeating attributes are stored as directory child objects.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia M. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 - 6:30, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2164

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. M. L./
Examiner, Art Unit 2164
August 31, 2009

/Charles Rones/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164